

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 17, 2008. Prior to the Office Action mailed November 17, 2008, Claims 1-9 and 21-31 were pending in the application. The present Response amends Claims 1, 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-9 and 21-31. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, and 21-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Brownlie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,157, hereinafter Brownlie) in view of Donohue (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,204, hereinafter Donohue) and further in view of Chamberlain (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,749, hereinafter Chamberlain), in alternative, in further view of De Meno et. al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0029517, hereinafter De Meno).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Donohue and further in view of Chamberlain (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,749, hereinafter Chamberlain), in alternative, in further view of De Meno et. al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0029517, hereinafter De Meno), and further in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,521, hereinafter Wang).

Claims 3-4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Donohue, and further in view of Chamberlain (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,749, hereinafter Chamberlain), in alternative, in further view of De Meno et. al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0029517, hereinafter De Meno), and further in view of Trcka et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0039579, hereinafter Trcka) and Microsoft Press (Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, ISBN:157231446XA, 1997, hereinafter Microsoft).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature "*wherein the accumulated delta is distributed with a version of the security policy to reconstruct a previously distributed local customized security policy in one step, wherein the accumulated delta represents the combined effect of the series of incremental changes to the security policy.*"

As stated by the Examiner in the pending Office Action, Brownlie et al. in view of Donohue do not suggest using the accumulated delta to reconstruct a previous state.

Chamberlain discloses the execution of patch rollback operation that needs to execute a patch rollback operation for each patch installation step (Column 13, Lines 45-57), in stead of a single step reconstruction as embodied in Claim 1.

In addition, De Meno teaches to recover information after undesirable changes (Paragraph [0023]). However, De Meno relies on storing a history of the information, in stead of calculating the accumulated delta that represents a combined effect of the series of incremental changes to the information.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Brownlie and other prior arts do not teach the accumulated delta which represents the combined effect of the series of incremental changes to the security policy and is used to reconstruct a previously distributed local customized security policy at one step.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31

Claims 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 22-25 and 27-29

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 22-25 and 27-29 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Application No.: 10/017,368
Reply to Office Action dated: November 17, 2008
Reply dated: January 20, 2009

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928